



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,850	10/30/2003	Eric H. Baker	1100P548US2	9757
73717	7590	07/16/2008	EXAMINER	
Kacvinsky LLC c/o Intelleivate P.O. Box 52050 Minneapolis, MN 55402			ZIEGLE, STEPHANIE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	
			07/16/2008	DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Status of Application***

1. This action is in response to the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed on 19 June 2008.
2. Claims 1-35 are pending in this application.
3. This action is FINAL.

***Examiner's Note***

4. The prosecution of this application is now being handled by a new examiner, Stephanie Ziegler, as the previous examiner has left the office.

***Response to Office Action Deficiencies***

5. Regarding claims 15-17 the applicant states that the rejection references Tam while failing to reference Barni and Lessin. The examiner would like to point out this typo seems to be the result of a cut and paste error in referencing Tam; the claim should reference Nakfoor and the correction has been made in the rejection below. Applicant has pointed out in page 8, lines 16-19 of the remarks filed on 19 June 2008 that, "Applicants respectfully submit that the above cited language referencing Tam and failing to reference Barni and Lessin renders the rejection of dependent claims 15, 16, and 17, additionally rejected on page 8 in view of Barni, Lessin, and US 6,496,809 to Nakfoor ("Nakfoor"), unclear." With regard to failing to reference Barni and Lessin, the examiner would like to point to the statement of rejection that indeed references Barni and Lessin and which states, "Claims 11, 14-17, and 20 which are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Barni, et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6,920,429] and Lessin [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0133445] as applied to claims 10, and 13 above, and further in view of Nakfoor [U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,809]."

6. Regarding the rejection of claims 18 and 19, the applicant states that the rejection is unclear due to the fact that "Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 13 that, as recited above, is rejected over Barni and Lessin...and Nakfoor and Maritzen fail to disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 13 (page 8 line 22 to page 9 line 2 of the Remarks)." The rejection in fact is correct and is clear because claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 15, which depends from claims 14, which in turn depends from claim 13. The rejection statement for claims 18 and 19 refers back to and encompasses the rejection of claim 15 whose rejection statement, which also encompasses claim 14, does reference Barni and Lessin.

### **Response to Arguments**

7. Applicant's arguments received on 19 June 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Referring to the previous Office action, Examiner has cited relevant portions of the references as a means to illustrate the systems as taught by the prior art. As a means of providing further clarification as to what is taught by the references used in the first Office action, Examiner has expanded the teachings for comprehensibility while maintaining the same grounds of rejection of the claims, except as noted above in the section labeled "Status of Claims." This information is intended to assist in illuminating the teachings of the references while providing evidence that establishes further support for the rejections of the claims.

With regard to the limitations of claims 1, 13, and 21, Applicant argues that, "Lessin fails to disclose the seller interface includes one or more options to donate at least a portion of funds received in exchange for the one or more goods; and ... transferring the portion of the funds for donation according to an option selection of the seller to a third party designated by the seller ...." The rejection pointed to paragraph 0019 in Lessin. Applicant further argues that Lessin discloses donating funds from future transactions, while the instant invention is directed to donating funds from goods that have already been sold. The examiner would like to point out that when a

business is pledging to make a donation from goods that are going to be sold, that the business must actually sell the goods before the donation can be made, and thus the goods would have already been sold at the point the donation is made. With regard to the transferring the portion of funds for donation, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that when a business pledges and collects the funds to make a donation, that the next logical step would be to actually transfer the funds to complete the donation process.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
9. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barni, et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6,920,429] and further in view of Lessin [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0133445].

Regarding Claim 1, Barni, et al. discloses, A system for providing logistics for a sale of one or more goods, the system being adapted to receive information from at least one remote seller and at least one remote buyer, to present a seller interface for receiving- information from the seller comprising a seller identity and a description of the one or more goods, to present the buyer with the description of the one or more goods while maintaining- the seller identity confidential from the buyer, and to provide financial logistics and shipping logistics for completing the sale of goods, wherein:

the financial logistics include collecting funds from a financial service provider designated by the buyer, deducting a fee for use of the system from the funds,

(Fig. 6, C4 L4-L8, C5 L30-L35, C8 L1-L3)

Barni, et al. does not explicitly disclose,  
the seller interface includes one or more options to donate at least a portion of  
funds received in exchange for the one or more goods;  
transferring the portion of the funds for donation according- to an option  
selection of the seller to a third party designated by the seller, without requiring  
interaction between the buyer and seller.

Lessin discloses,  
the seller interface includes one or more options to donate at least a portion of  
funds received in exchange for the one or more goods;  
transferring the portion of the funds for donation according- to an option  
selection of the seller to a third party designated by the seller, without requiring  
interaction between the buyer and seller.

(¶19)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Lessin in the device of Barni, et al., in order to donate profits to charity  
(¶19 from Lessin).

Regarding Claims 2-4, Barni, et al. fails to explicitly disclose third party comprising a charitable or nonprofit entity, political action committee, fundraising entity.

However, the difference between a third party as disclosed by Barni, et al. and the named entities is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the third party would be performed the same regardless of whether the entity was

charitable, political action committee or fundraising entity. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have different entities such as named above because the third party name does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claim 6, Barni, et al. further discloses, wherein the system is adapted to receive the information over a computer network. (**Fig. 6, C4 L4-L8, C5 L30-L35, C8 L1-L3**)

Regarding Claim 7, Barni, et al. further discloses,

wherein the financial logistics comprises conducting an auction over the computer network. (**Fig. 6, C4 L4-L8, C5 L30-L35, C8 L1-L3**)

Regarding Claim 9, Barni, et al. further discloses, wherein the system is adapted to provide the shipping logistics by use of at least one geography-based and time-based strategy. (**Fig. 6, C4 L4-L8, C5 L30-L35, C8 L1-L3**)

Regarding Claim 10, Barni, et al. further discloses,

- wherein the goods are time-sensitive. (**Fig. 6, C4 L4-L8, C5 L30-L35, C8 L1-L3**)

Regarding Claim 12, Barni, et al. further discloses, wherein the financial logistics include authorizing an amount of sale on a credit card of the buyer, charging the credit card for the amount

of sale, receiving the amount of sale, and transferring at least a portion of the amount of sale to the third party. (**Fig. 6, C4 L4-L8, C5 L30-L35, C8 L1-L3**)

Regarding Claim 13, Barni, et al. discloses,

A method for providing logistics for a sale of one or more goods comprising the steps of:  
receiving information from a the seller, including a description of certain goods, a method of sale for the certain goods,  
presenting the description of the certain goods to a prospective buyer according to the method of sale;  
conducting the sale over a computer network;  
providing financial logistics, including collecting proceeds from a financial service provider designated by the buyer, deducting a fee for use of the system from the proceeds,  
providing shipping logistics, including arranging for transfer of the one or more goods to the buyer.

**(Fig. 6, C4 L4-L8, C5 L30-L35, C8 L1-L3)**

Barni, et al. does not explicitly disclose,  
an option selection including at least a portion of proceeds for donation and an identity of a third party that will receive proceeds from the sale;  
transferring the portion of the proceeds for donation according- to the option selection of the seller to the third party;

Lessin discloses,  
an option selection including at least a portion of proceeds for donation and an identity of a third party that will receive proceeds from the sale;  
transferring the portion of the proceeds for donation according- to

the option selection of the seller to the third party;

(¶19)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Lessin in the device of Barni, et al., in order to donate profits to charity (¶19 from Lessin).

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barni, et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6,920, 429] and Lessin [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0133445] as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Maritzen, et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 5,987, 429].

Regarding Claim 5, Maritzen et al. discloses,

- wherein said financial logistics comprises providing said entity with information regarding the seller sufficient to allow the entity to generate an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes.

(Fig. 2B, 6)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Maritzen et al. in the device of Barni, et al., in order to calculate the appropriate fee since specific information about the transaction may change the fee. (**Abstract from Maritzen et al.**)

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barni, et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6,920, 429] and Lessin [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0133445] as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Salls [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0152130].

Regarding Claim 8, Salls discloses,

- wherein the financial logistics comprises conducting a raffle over the computer network.

**(Abstract)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Salls in the device of Barni, et al., in order to allow remote individuals to participate and allow the seller to obtain a predetermined amount based on the number of tickets sold. (**¶ 10-12 from Salls**)

12. Claims 11, 14-17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barni, et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6,920,429] and Lessin [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0133445] as applied to claims 10, 13 above, and further in view of Nakfoor [U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,809].

Regarding Claim 11, Nakfoor further discloses, The system of claim 10

- wherein the goods are event tickets. (**Fig. 4**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Nakfoor in the device of Barni, et al., in order to transfer the tickets and money in a timely manner since the worth of the tickets expire due to the event ending. (**Abstract from Nakfoor**)

Regarding Claim 14, Nakfoor discloses,

- wherein the goods comprise event tickets. (**Fig. 4**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Nakfoor in the device of Barni, et al., in order to transfer the tickets and

money in a timely manner since the worth of the tickets expire due to the event ending. (**Abstract from Nakfoor**)

Regarding Claims 15, 16, 17, Nakfoor et al. fails to explicitly disclose third party comprising a charitable or nonprofit entity, political action committee, fundraising entity.

However, the difference between a third party as disclosed by Barni, et al. and the named entities is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the third party would be performed the same regardless of whether the entity was charitable, political action committee or fundraising entity. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have different entities such as named above because the third party name does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claim 20, Barni, et al. further discloses,

wherein said system is adapted to provide said shipping logistics by use of at least one geography-based and time-based strategy. (**Fig. 6**)

13. Claims 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakfoor [U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,809] as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Maritzen, et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 5,987, 429].

Regarding Claim 18, Maritzen et al. discloses,

- providing the charitable or nonprofit entity with information regarding the seller sufficient to allow the entity to generate an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes. (**Fig. 2B, 6**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Maritzen et al. in the device of Nakfoor, in order to calculate the appropriate fee since specific information about the transaction may change the fee. (**Abstract from Maritzen et al.**)

Regarding Claim 19, Maritzen et al. discloses,

- causing an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes to be provided to the seller. (**Fig. 2B, 6**)

14. Claims 21-22, 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salls [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0152130] and further in view of Lessin [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0133445].

Regarding Claim 21, Salls discloses,

A computerized method for conducting a raffle,

comprising the steps of:

receiving requests to purchase raffle tickets from a plurality of buyers over a computer network;

receiving identification information from the plurality of buyers;

creating a record of the plurality of buyers weighted according to the number of

tickets purchased by each buyer;  
selecting a winner at random from the record;  
notifying the winner

**(Abstract, Fig. 8, 13)**

Salls does not explicitly disclose,  
Receiving information from a first party comprising- a description of one or more goods  
providing the first party with one or more options for donating- proceeds  
receiving an option selection from the first party;  
donating the proceeds to a third party in accordance with the option selection of the first party.

Lessin discloses,  
Receiving information from a first party comprising- a description of one or more goods  
providing the first party with one or more options for donating- proceeds  
receiving an option selection from the first party;  
donating the proceeds to a third party in accordance with the option selection of the first party.

**(¶19)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Lessin in the device of Salls, in order to donate profits to charity (**¶19 from Lessin**).

Regarding Claim 22, Salls further discloses, wherein the winner wins goods provided by a first party. (Fig. 14)

Regarding Claim 29, Salls fails to explicitly disclose a spreadsheet.

However, the difference between database as disclosed by Salls and the spreadsheet is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the database would be performed the same regardless of whether the spreadsheet existed. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to create a spreadsheet from the database table or view the table because the database tables do not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claim 30, Salls fails to explicitly disclose the method of determining the primary key.

However, the difference between primary key as disclosed by Salls and the row number in the spreadsheet is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the primary key would be performed the same regardless of whether the row number in the spreadsheet was generated by a formula. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed

invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use a row number generated by a formula in a spreadsheet because the primary key does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claims 31, Salls fails to explicitly disclose random number as the row number in a spreadsheet.

However, the difference between random number as disclosed by Salls and the random number as a row number is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the random number would be performed the same regardless of whether the random number as a row number was used. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to random number as a row number because the random number does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claim 32, The method of claim 21 wherein the record is created by sequentially assigning numbers to the plurality of buyers based on the number of tickets purchased by each buyer, wherein a winner is selected by generating a random number between one and the total number of tickets sold, and wherein the winner is the buyer corresponding to the random number.

Regarding Claim 32, Salls fails to explicitly disclose the random number being less than the number of tickets sold.

However, the difference between random number as disclosed by Salls and the random number equal to or less than the number of tickets sold is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the random number would be performed the same regardless of whether the random number equal to or less than the number of tickets sold. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to generate the random number equal to or less than the number of tickets sold because the random number does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

15. Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salls [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0152130] and Lessin [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0133445] as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Nakfoor [U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,809].

Regarding Claim 23, Nakfoor discloses,

- wherein the goods comprise event tickets. (Abstract)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Nakfoor in the device of Salls, in order to transfer the tickets and money in a timely manner since the worth of the tickets expire due to the event ending. (**Abstract from Nakfoor**)

Regarding Claim 24,

receiving information from the first party, including the identity of a the third party that will receive the proceeds of the raffle; and presenting information to the plurality of buyers that transferring proceeds from raffle tickets purchased will be donated to the third party.

Examiner notes that this is well known in the art at the time of the invention. For example, Churches routinely offer raffles to raise money for charities.

Regarding Claims 25-27, Barni, et al. fails to explicitly disclose third party comprising a charitable or nonprofit entity, political action committee, fundraising entity.

However, the difference between a third party as disclosed by Salls and the named entities is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the third party would be performed the same regardless of whether the entity was charitable, political action committee or fundraising entity. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the

prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to have different entities such as named above because the third party name does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding Claim 28, Salls further discloses, The method of claim 25, further comprising the step of:

- causing an acknowledgement for tax reporting purposes to be provided to the first party. (**¶ 6-8**)
16. Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salls [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0152130] and Lessin [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0133445] as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Petras, et al. [U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0047290].

Regarding Claim 33, Petras et al. discloses,

- wherein the winner is notified over the computer network. (**¶ 220**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Petras et al. in the device of Salls, in order to provide automatic notification since this be one of the effective methods in contacting the parties involved (**¶ 220 from Petras et al.**).

Regarding Claim 34, Petras et al. further discloses, The method of claim 33

- wherein the winner is notified by automatically generating an email to the winner. (**¶ 220**)

Regarding Claim 35, The method of claim 33 wherein the winner is notified by automatically generating an instant message to the winner.

Regarding Claim 35, Petras et al. fails to explicitly disclose an instant message being sent.

However, the difference between an email being sent as disclosed by Petras et al. and the instant message is only found in the non-functional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Defining the electronic message sent would be performed the same regardless of whether the instant message was used. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to send an instant message because the generating of an electronic message such as an email does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the order does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of

the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

***Conclusion***

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephanie Ziegler whose telephone number is (571)272-4417. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri: 7:30a-4:00p (off every other Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Kambiz Abdi** can be reached on (571) 272-6702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,850

Page 20

Art Unit: 3692

/Stephanie Ziegler/ Examiner, Art Unit 3692

1 July 2008

/Nga B. Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692